

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

JAMES D. GRIEPSMA,

Plaintiff,

v.

CHRISTIAN J. ANDERSON, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Case No. C19-181-RSM-MLP

ORDER

This is a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 prisoner civil rights action. Currently pending before the Court is Defendants' response to Plaintiff's pending motions and motion for a new deadline to file their reply in support of summary judgment motion ("Defendants' Motion").¹ (Dkt. # 75.) Defendants request a new deadline to file a reply brief and that Petitioner's pending motions that were received by the Court, but not filed or reviewed by this Court prior to this Court's submission of

¹ On June 3, 2020, this matter was referred back to the Court after this Court submitted a Report and Recommendation on May 6, 2020, to the Honorable Ricardo S. Martinez regarding Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment. (Dkt. ## 66, 74). Several of Plaintiff's filings, including his Response to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment (dkt. ## 68-72) were received by the Court via email between April 23 and April 24, 2020, but not filed until May 12, 2020, due to an issue with the Court's Prisoner Electronic Filing Procedures. (Dkt. # 74.) This matter was referred back to the Court for consideration of the additional documents. (*Id.*)

1 a Report and Recommendation regarding Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, be denied
2 or stricken. (Dkt. # 75 at 1-3.)

3 Accordingly, having reviewed Defendants' Motion, the balance of the record, and finding
4 good cause, the Court hereby ORDERS as follows:

5 (1) Defendants' motion for a new deadline to file their reply is GRANTED. The deadline
6 for Defendants to file their reply is amended to June 22, 2020.

7 (2) Plaintiff's motion for an extension of time to file a response to Defendants' motion
8 for summary judgment (dkt. # 69) is DENIED as moot because Plaintiff timely filed a
9 response and supporting declaration on April 24, 2020.

10 (3) Plaintiff's motion to file an over-length response (dkt. # 70) is DENIED as moot
11 because, despite Plaintiff filing a 60-page response on April 24, 2020, Plaintiff's filed
12 response contains multiple duplicates of pages. Once sorted, Plaintiff's response
13 totals 24 pages and complies with Local Rule 7(e)(3).

14 (4) Plaintiff's "Notice to Defendants for Constitutional Challenge to Motion for
15 Summary Judgment" (dkt. # 68) is DENIED and STRICKEN as the document seeks
16 no relief, and instead, lists questions and arguments that are duplicative of arguments
17 identified and argued in Plaintiff's response (dkt. # 71).

18 (5) Plaintiff's motion to substitute a new declaration for his original declaration (dkt.
19 # 67) is DENIED as untimely because Plaintiff filed this motion on May 8, 2020,
20 which was 14 days after the deadline for filing his response had passed on April 24,
21 2020.

22 (6) The Clerk is directed to send copies of this Order to the parties.
23

1 Dated this 15th day of June, 2020.

2 

3 MICHELLE L. PETERSON
4 United States Magistrate Judge